### SUBJECT BILL NO.-Please return this slip to a messenger PROMPTLY. Speaking for information only; Neither for nor against: (Representing) (City and Zip Code) (Street Address or Route Number) Registering Against Speaking in Favor: **Speaking Against:** Registering in Favor: SENATE HEARING SLIP こころと Senate Sergeant-At-Arms State Capitol - B35 South P.O.Box 7882 Madison, WI 53707-7882 (Please Print Plainly) but not speaking: but not speaking: SUBJECT\_ DATE: Anni V Law BILL NO Please return this slip to a messenger PROMPTLY. (NAME) (Street Address or Route Number) only; Neither for nor against: Speaking for information (Representing) (City and Zip Code) Registering Against: Speaking Against: Speaking in Favor: Registering in Favor: SENATE HEARING SLIP 2007 7 Senate Sergeant-At-Arms State Capitol - B35 South Madison, WI 53707-7882 P.O.Box 7882 (Please Print Plainly) but not speaking: but not speaking: LUSCA

# SENATE HEARING SLIP

(Please Print Plainly)

SHRIECT	01	BILL NO	DATE:
		SB 207	00.56

Registering Against:	Registering in Favor: but <u>not</u> speaking:	Speaking Against:	Speaking in Favor:	(Representing)	(City and Zip Code) State Bur - Tamuly Law	Madison S3705	(Street Address or Route Number)	(NAME)	Linda Roberson
			7	OR KITLAN	رينها ر	280	mber)		

Please return this slip to a messenger PROMPTLY

Senate Sergeant-At-Arms State Capitol - B35 South

Madison, WI 53707-7882

P.O.Box 7882

Speaking for information only; Neither for nor against:

but not speaking:

83208

### DATE: SUBJECT BILL NO WI COAUTION HEAMIST DINNESTE Please return this slip to a messenger PROMPTLY. only; Neither for nor against: Speaking for information (NAME) (Representing) (Street Address or Route Number) Registering Against Speaking in Favor: (City and Zip Code) Speaking Against: Registering in Favor SENATE HEARING SLIP MOISON WI 53703 307 S. PATERSON #1 Senate Sergeant-At-Arms State Capitol - B35 South (Please Print Plainly) but not speaking: but not speaking: DATE: (Representing) BILL NO. HXSELF (City and Zip Code) (Street Address or Route Number) (NAME) SUBJECT Speaking Against: Speaking in Favor: Registering in Favor: MARYAPIA Please return this slip to a messenger PROMPTLY Speaking for information Registering Against: only; Neither for nor against: 2904 WADNOWA WAY MACISS SENATE HEARING SLIP Senate Sergeant-At-Arms State Capitol - B35 South but not speaking: but not speaking: (Please Print Plainly) SB 20 200

Madison, WI 53707-7882

Madison, WI 53707-7882

P.O.Box 7882

P.O.Box 7882

## Vote Record

# Senate Committee on Judiciary and Consumer Affairs

Moved by: AB: AB:		sman 202	Cleari	nded by: nghouse Rule: intment:	Sen. O	lar ling
AJR: A:	SJR: SR:		Omer			
A/S Amdt:  A/S Amdt:  A/S Sub Amdt:  A/S Amdt:  A/S Amdt:		to A/S Amdt: to A/S Sub Amc to A/S Amdt:	-  t: _		to A/S Sub Ar	mat:
Be recommended for:  Passage Introduction Adoption Rejection				ndefinite Postpor Fabling Concurrence Nonconcurrence Confirmation	nement	
Committee Mem Sen. Gary George Sen. Fred Risser Sen. Alice Clausir Sen. Joanne Hue Sen. Alberta Darli	e, Chair ng Isman		Aye X X X X	No 	Absent	Not Voting
		Totals:	5	0		
		- 				

Motion Carried

Motion Failed



### **BRIAN BURKE**

WISCONSIN STATE SENATOR

Senate Chair, Joint Committee on Finance

# Testimony of Senator Brian Burke Senate Bill 202 Senate Committee on Judiciary and Consumer Affairs January 25, 2000

Wisconsin residents should have access to our state courts to get a divorce.

In the past, our courts had the authority to grant a divorce to a petitioner residing in this state when the respondent had been properly served. This long-standing practice was interrupted when the court of appeals in *Mendez v. Hernandez-Mendez* held that the court must also have grounds to exercise personal jurisdiction over the non-resident party.

Wisconsin residents now face obstacles to obtaining a divorce when their spouse does not have sufficient minimum contacts with this state. They are forced to return to the courts in the state of original residency, which can be costly and time-consuming.

The result in the *Mendez* decision unduly burdens low-income individuals relocating to Wisconsin who lack the means to make the trip back to their home state. It also presents hurdles to domestic violence survivors who make the courageous decision to leave their abusers and begin a new life in another state.

To reopen the doors of our judicial system, I introduced Senate Bill 202 which allows Wisconsin residents to obtain a divorce in our courts regardless of whether the court has personal jurisdiction over the respondent.

With the passage of this legislation, Wisconsin will rejoin the 49 other states in the nation by providing an appropriate forum for its residents to end their marriage to a spouse with few or no links to the state.

I urge the committee to act favorably on SB 202 to restore fairness and consistency to our family court proceedings.



5302 Eastpark Blvd. P.O. Box 7158 Madison, WI 53707-7158

October 19, 1999

State Senator Gary George State Capitol, Room 118 South Madison, Wisconsin

Dear Senator George:

There are three bills in the Senate Judiciary and Consumer Affairs Committee that we would like to bring to your attention.

Senate Bill 202 is supported by the State Bar Family Law Section. In Mendez v Hernandez Mendez 213 Wis. 2d 217 (Wis. App 1997), the court decided that a married person coming or returning to Wisconsin can no longer end the marriage in Wisconsin courts unless the other spouse also spent some time in the state during the marriage. The bill corrects this jurisdictional problem and will allow our courts to provide a divorce to people who have come or returned to Wisconsin to pursue opportunities or seek safety.

Senate Bill 158 is supported by both the Elder Law and Real Property, Probate and Trust Law Sections of the State Bar. In addition, the Milwaukee Bar Association's Board of Directors also voted to support SB 158. SB 158 is in response to a 1997 case, Community Care of Milwaukee County v. Evelyn O., 214 Wis. 2d 433 (Ct. App. 1997), which did not allow for petitioner's attorney fees to be paid for by the ward's estate. As a result of this case it has been difficult for elder law attorneys, county social services, adult protective services and others to be able to provide for the protection of incompetent individuals within the current guardianship system. SB 158 balances the interests of the ward by establishing guidelines for awarding these fees under the court's discretion.

Senate Bill 117 is supported by the Business Law Section of the State Bar. SB 117 repeals the antiquated bulk transfer provision under Article 6 of the Uniform Commercial Code. UCC Article 6 relates to the transfer of bulk goods and the notice which is required when there is a bulk sale of inventory. The repeal of Article 6 has been recommended by the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws and the American Law Institute since 1989 and has already been adopted by 36 other states.

We would appreciate a public hearing on these bills before your committee and we would be happy to further discuss their merits with you.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,

Linda Barth

Public Affairs Director